REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-33 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 21 and 23-33 stand rejected. Claims 2, 6, 8-10, 13-15, 18-20 and 22 stand objected to. Claims 1 and 21 were cancelled. Claims 2-4, 8, 11, 16-17, 22-23, and 30 were amended. Claims 1-6, 8-20, and 22-33 remain in the application.

Claims 2, 6, 8-10, 13-15, 18-20 and 22 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. This has been done.

Claims 1, 3-4, 11-12, 21, 27 and 32-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richard in view of Lewis. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richard in view of Lewis, and further in view of Lo et al. Claims 16 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richard in view of Lewis, and further in view of Lo et al. Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richard in view of Lewis, and further in view of Toyoshima et al. Claims 26 and 28-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richard in view of Lewis, and further in view of Threlkeld. Claims 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richard in view of Lewis, and further in view of Kanbayashi. Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richard in view of Lewis, and further in view of Kanbayashi. Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richard in view of Lewis, and further in view of Muench.

Claims 1 and 21 were cancelled.

Claims 3-5, 11-12, 16-17, 26-30, and 32-33 have been amended to depend from Claim 2 and are allowable on that basis. Claims 23-25, and 31 have been amended to depend from Claim 22 and are allowable on that basis.

It is believed that these changes now make the claims clear and definite and, if there are any problems with these changes, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant(s) Registration No. 30,700

Robert Luke Walker/amb Rochester, NY 14650

Telephone: (585) 588-2739 Facsimile: (585) 477-1148